DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 877 CE 049 532

TITLE	Lafayette Parish Cooperative Jail Project--LPCJP. Phase III Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Lafayette Parish School Board, La.
SPONS AGENCY	Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, Baton Rouge.; Louisiana State Dept. of Education, Baton Rouge. Bureau of Adult and Community Education.
PUB DATE	87
GRANT	ABE-2-87
NOTE	21p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Adult Literacy; *Correctional Education; Correctional Rehabilitation; English (Second Language); *High School Equivalency Programs; Literacy Education; *Outcomes of Education; Prisoners; *Program Effectiveness; *Second Language Instruction; Spanish

ABSTRACT

A three-phase project was conducted to further the education of inmates in the Lafayette (Louisiana) Parish Correctional Center. Phase I of the project was designed to prepare inmates to be eligible to take the General Educational Development (GED) test, and/or to teach life-coping skills so that they would better function in society upon their release. This phase of the program also provided training for inmates to assist other inmates in learning these skills. During Phase II of the program, the purpose was expanded to include English-as-a-second-language (ESL) classes, along with more life coping skills and inmate training time. Phase III continued with these purposes, but was expanded to include Spanish as a second language (SSL) for prison deputies and literacy classes in Spanish for Spanish inmates who were illiterate in their native language. Classes were held five days per week. The overall project served 910 inmates (815 males and 95 females) and 18 deputies. A total of 304 students were recommended for the GED test, and 255 passed; 45 adult basic education (ABE) students progressed to the GED classes. The Spanish classes also were successful. As a result of the accomplishments of the program and of the support and cooperation from the Lafayette Parish Sheriff's Department and the community, the program was recommended to be reinstated as soon as funds can be reappropriated. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290877

LAFAYETTE PARISH COOPERATIVE JAIL PROJECT -- LPCJP

Lafayette Parish School Board

State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

Dr. James Mesa, Jr., Executive Director
Milton Hamel, President
Dr. Claire R. Landry, Vice President
Marie Louise Suellings, Secretary-Treasurer
Jesse H. Bankston
Dr. John A. Bertrand
Felician Fourrier, S.C.
Gloria J. Harrison
Martha Scott Henry
Keith Johnson
Rev. Lionel Johnson Sr.
Jack A. Pellegrin

Grant Number: ABE-2-87

Bureau of Adult and Community Education
Louisiana State Department of Education
Thomas A. Clausen, Superintendent

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G Bossette

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE049532

"The project reported herein was supported by a grant from the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education through the U.S. Department of Education, as authorized by the Adult Education Act (Public Law 91-230 as amended)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LAFAYETTE PARISH COOPERATIVE JAIL PROJECT -- LPCJP

Lafayette Parish School Board
P. O. Drawer 2158
Lafayette, Louisiana 70502

(318)232-3849

Robert M. Arceneaux, Supervisor
Adult and Community Education
Project Director

PHASE III

Final Report

1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
GLOSSARY	iii
Title	
ABSTRACT	1
Purpose	1
Procedure	1
Results and Conclusion	2
EXTENT TO WHICH OBJECTIVES WERE ACCOMPLISHED	4
Objective One: Awareness Phase	4
Objective Two: Training Phase	5
Objective Three: Recruitment Phase	7
Objective Four: Application Phase	8
Objective Five: Evaluation Phase	9
FACTORS WHICH ENABLED THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES	11
SUMMARY OF ON-GOING ACTIVITIES	11
BACKGROUND METHOLOGY	12
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	14
FINAL EXPENDITURE REPORT	16

GLOSSARY

ABE	------	Adult Basic Education
C.A.T.	------	California Achievement Test
ESL	------	English As A Second Language
G.E.D.	------	General Educational Development
LPCC	------	Lafayette Parish Correctional Center
LPCJP	------	Lafayette Parish Cooperative Jail Project
SSL	------	Spanish As A Second Language
VITA	------	Volunteer Instructors Teaching Adults

ABSTRACT

Purpose

Phase I of the project was designed for a two-fold purpose: (1) prepare inmates to be eligible to take the G.E.D. test, and/or (2) teach life-coping skills so that they would better function in society upon their release. Additionally, the program was to provide training to inmates who were capable of teaching classes and providing tutorial assistance to at least three other inmates who were functioning at or near the same academic level. This would provide direct assistance to the teacher and allow a larger number of inmates to be enrolled in the program.

During Phase II of the program, the purpose was expanded to include English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. Also recognizing that the majority of our students were being released before receiving what we believed to be an adequate amount of life-coping skills classes; the Adult Basic Education (ABE) and Volunteer Instructors Teaching Adults (VITA) classes were intensified. Our purpose was to provide the student with twice the amount of classroom time he had received in Phase I.

Phase III continued with the purposes outlined above, but was expanded to include: Spanish as a Second Language (SSL) for prison deputies and literacy classes in Spanish for Spanish inmates that were illiterate in their own native language.

Procedure

As in Phase I and II, the project was conducted at the new

Lafayette Parish Correctional Center. Due to space limitations, only one classroom was provided, in lieu of, the three classrooms originally proposed under Phase I. To accommodate the needs of the students and to comply with the functional operation of the institution along with various security restrictions, classes were held five days per week with ABE and VITA classes from 8:30 to 10:30 a.m. and G.E.D. classes from 12:30 to 3:30 p.m. Each afternoon was divided into two, one and a half hour sessions. In conjunction with the G.E.D. classes, ESL, SSL and Spanish literacy classes were held on Tuesday, Thursday and Fridays. The project was conducted in five phases: Awareness, Training, Recruitment, Application and Evaluation.

Results and Conclusions

The overall project served 910 inmates--815 males and 95 females. In addition 18 sheriff deputies participated--12 received their G.E.D. diplomas. A total of 304 students were recommended for the G.E.D. test--255 passed, 21 were transferred prior to testing, 28 failed (of these, 22 transferred or were released prior to retesting); six remain in the program.

There were nine (9) VITA students that progressed to the ABE classes. Forty-five (45) ABE students progressed to the GED classes. Of these, five (5) earned their diplomas.

Three (3) deputies who enrolled in the Spanish classes were awarded diplomas for completing the first phase of the "Spanish for Law Enforcement Officers" course.

Two (2) Spanish inmates were illiterate in their native language. They were given basic Spanish classes and were upgraded

from a Level 1 to a Level 2.

The overall project totals were outstanding. As a result of the accomplishments of the program and as a result of the support and cooperation of the Lafayette Parish Sheriff's Department and that of the community, it is recommended that the program be reinstated as soon as funds can be reappropriated.

EXTENT TO WHICH OBJECTIVES WERE ACCOMPLISHED

Objective One: Awareness Phase

During all phases, information about the overall program was disseminated to the inmate population via several methods. During special inmate assemblies, the project instructor gave a presentation about the project, which included a general question and answer session. At that time an appeal was made for tutors. Application forms were distributed, soliciting students and tutors. Articles were written for, and appeared in, the prison newspaper. Posters were displayed, and flyers were distributed throughout the facility--in cell-pods, recreation rooms, library, classrooms and the gym. On-going conferences between the project director, the project instructor, the parish sheriff and his staff were held. These conferences included the prison warden, prison counselors, and the heads of the security and classification departments. The importance of cooperation and coordination from all divisions of the facility was emphatically stated. Other areas of concern were outlined by both sides. The special prison team that was set up during Phase I was also available at all times to the project instructor for any assistance requested. Also the review panel that was established in Phase I continued to screen all inmate records for potential candidates--tutors and students. The overall cooperation by the prison warden and his staff during the awareness phase was again, extraordinary.

Objective Two: Training Phase

A. Tutor Selection

During the term of the project, 131 individuals were identified, screened and selected as potential teacher aides/tutors. Each individual was then interviewed and tested. During the interview, job responsibilities were outlined as follows:

1. participate in a 12-hour tutor training workshop,
2. accepting the assignment of at least three students to tutor a minimum of two hours each week,
3. attending classes with their students and assisting the project teachers with their instruction,
4. keeping data sheets as required by the project teacher,
5. attending weekly "staff" meetings,
6. supporting the recruitment, promotion and retention of students.

Each candidate was then required to take and score a minimum of 13.0 grade level on all three sections--reading, language and mathematics--of the California Achievement Test/Level 18. Of the 131 applicants, 93 were selected. In addition to the test requirement, they were selected for their varied backgrounds, experiences and degrees of expertise. Several had college degrees. Some had college experience. Many had not had the experience of teaching others. However, all were very motivated and enthusiastic about the project.

B. Tutor Training

Tutor training workshops were conducted each month during

this reporting period. Each workshop consisted of 12 hours of training. The sessions included, but were not limited, to the following:

1. familiarization with adult education,
2. familiarization with materials and procedures used in teaching particular academic skills,
3. awareness of the characteristics and implications for teaching adults--when using the life-skills approach,
4. the methology of teaching basic reading, writing and computation skills, while tutoring, and while under the supervision of the project instructor,
5. familiarization with materials used in the diagnosis, placement and assessment phases,
6. analyzing test results to determine the future needs of the student,
7. providing remedial instruction.

Other training sessions were held, as needed, due to the transfer and release of inmate tutors.

Each week, throughout the duration of this project, a working group session was held with all tutors and the project instructor. Tutor techniques, methods and materials were discussed. Problem areas were discussed and resolved. Suggestions were proposed, and those valid, were adopted. Dissemination of information and notification to the inmate population for student recruitment was emphasized. The importance of teaching life-coping skills was re-emphasized. Tutor enrollment and training was always on-going. Due to releases and transfers, 25-30 tutors were generally available to the program. To enhance the tutor program, an inmate was selected by the

project instructor to be the "chief tutor." His position proved to be extremely valuable to the project instructor and other prison officials. He became the chief link between the inmates and others on the "outside" involved with the program. In fact, he was eventually assigned an assistant. In addition to the head tutor, three other "specialists" were used as classroom instructors in the math, reading and language areas. Five others were specifically assigned to ABE, VITA, ESL, SSL and the Spanish literacy classes.

Objective Three: Recruitment Phase

Recruitment was generally the same throughout the project. The target population of 430 inmates was requested to submit application forms to the prison counselor and operations officers. Initial screening was done through these offices. Approved applications were then given an explanation of the program. Specific goals of, and commitment to the program were discussed. To determine student assessment and eligibility, a complete battery (Level 18) of the California Achievement Test (C.A.T.) was administered. Those applicants whose skills averaged above the 5.0 level were enrolled in the G.E.D. program. As a result of the testing, it was found that 57 were either at, or below the 5.0 level. A decision by the project director to "expand and intensify" the ABE and VITA programs resulted in the expansion of basic reading, writing and life-coping skills classes. Instruction was accomplished in conjunction with the afternoon G.E.D. classes. In addition, five (5) morning classes were added. More tutors were selected specifically for the ABE and VITA

classes. These classes eventually provided instruction to 57 inmates. Qualified tutors, versed in the English and Spanish languages, were also selected to teach the SSL and Spanish literacy classes. Twenty-eight (28) deputies participated in the SSL classes. Six (6) Spanish nationals participated in the Spanish literacy classes. These special classes were adminstered through the project instructor, the VITA director, and under the guidance of the LPJCP project director. Because of the turnover rate, inherent to a parish prison system, the recruitment effort was an on-going one. The average monthly student enrollment was 120. However, continuous recruitment efforts resulted in the servicing of 910 inmates.

As the program progressed, it became apparent that LPCC had a large contingent of Spanish speaking inmates. The project instructor requested and received approval to begin an English speaking language (ESL) class. Seventy-six (76) Spanish inmates were recruited as students. Also nine (9) Spanish inmates were recruited as tutors. The course was monitored on a daily basis by the project instructor. Fourteen (14) of these have taken and passed their Spanish G.E.D. test.

Objective Four: Application Phase

The classroom used was on the fourth floor of the correctional facility. The library was continuously updated with a well stocked inventory of materials. The types of materials were based on a sequential program of study determined by the results of the C.A.T. Supplementary teacher-made and life-coping skills materials were also made available.

Students were assigned to classes and "matched" with tutors within their cell-pods on their respective floors. This was done because of security restrictions, cell assignments, and individual court directed restrictions.

Classes were conducted in one and a half hour sessions, five days per week. Tutors were required to attend all classes with their students. This allowed the project instructor to assure that the tutors were always abreast of their students' needs and progress. The tutor also fulfilled his responsibility as a classroom teacher's aide. Many classes were, in fact, conducted by the classroom instructors, under the guidance and supervision of the project instructor. The average attendance was 1,155 hours per month. Throughout this phase, student performance was monitored. Weekly conferences were held between tutors and the project instructor. Teaching methods, techniques and materials were discussed. An outline of each student's progress was analyzed and recorded. Additions and/or deletions to his/her program were made. The tutors' commitment to this project was always evident. In addition to the classroom hours attended, the average tutor/student hours recorded outside the classroom was 1,325 hours per month.

Objective Five: Evaluation Phase

Of the 749 students participating in the G.E.D. phase of the program, 92 made gains of .1-.9 levels; 169 made gains of 1.0-1.9 levels; 67 made gains of 2.0-3.0 levels; and 128 made gains of three (3) levels or above. The remaining 293 were not retested due to releases or transfers. Three hundred four (304) students met all

G.E.D. evaluation requirements and were recommended for the G.E.D. test--255 passed; 28 failed (of those, 22 were transferred or released prior to retest).

FACTORS WHICH ENABLED THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES

These factors were dominant throughout the project term:

1. Collaboration with and the total cooperation of the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center personnel.
2. The continued professionalism, commitment, and dedication of the project instructor.
3. The advice and assistance rendered by the professional teachers of the Adult Education Center.
4. The services of the program director.
5. The services of the adult education secretary.
6. The profound dedication to the project by the Sheriff and his prison warden.
7. The services, sense of purpose, dedication and enthusiasm of the tutors/teacher aides.
8. The structuring of a sound recruitment and awareness campaign.
9. The LPCC G.E.D. review panel.
10. Attendance at various conferences by the project director and the prison warden.
11. The intense desire of each student to reach his individual goal.
12. The services of two "dedicated" security officers assigned directly to the G.E.D. program.

SUMMARY OF ON-GOING ACTIVITIES

The following activities took place concomitantly through all phases of the project:

1. Project director meetings and on-site visitations.
2. Recruiting, training and placing of tutors/teacher aides.
3. Recruiting, placing, teaching and evaluating students.
4. Publicizing the program through all forms of media.
5. Tutor/project instructor meetings and/or individual student

conferences.

6. Formal and informal instruction.

7. Updating and maintenance of the G.E.D. library.

8. Analysis and updating of individual programs in conjunction with the students' progress.

9. Recordkeeping: class attendance, lessons covered, tutor assistance periods, student progress.

10. Recruiting, training and placing of the most qualified tutors as classroom instructors.

BACKGROUND METHOLOGY

Phase I of the Project began in September, 1984, when the project director conducted planning sessions with key officials of the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center (LPCC). Arrangements were made to establish classes; along with a G.E.D. library at the new prison facility. The new facility was tentatively scheduled to open at the end of October. Consequently, all projected schedules were dependent on the final transfer of inmates to the new prison. However, in the interim, the recruitment, testing and selection of teacher aides/tutors was implemented.

In October, construction problems forced prison officials to delay the transfer of inmates to the new facility. The target date was set at early December. By mid October the project instructor had selected an initial cadre of teacher aides/tutors and had conducted two workshops for them. He continued to screen, test and select potential teacher aides/tutors.

In November, the recruitment of potential students began. Initially, 105 inmates expressed an interest in the G.E.D. program.

However, due to limited space in the old jail facility and for security reasons, only 30 were accepted. The remaining were placed on a waiting list. During this first testing session, 10 inmates were identified as non-readers and were referred to the VITA Program.

In early December, a limited number of classes were held at the old jail. Construction of the new jail was complete. However, the inmate transfer did not start until late December. Meantime, the project instructor set up the G.E.D. library. He also continued the recruiting, testing and selecting of the students and tutors on the waiting list. By the end of December, 43 inmates were in classes with 16 teacher aides/tutors. Sixteen more inmates had been referred to the VITA Program.

By mid January, 1985, the inmate transfers were complete. The project director again, had several conferences with prison offficials, re-emphasizing the goals of the project. The response of the LPCC officials was outstanding. LPCC personnel from administration, operations and security were assigned to the project. They were literally at the disposal of the project instructor. Classes were scheduled five afternoons each week. Due to security restrictions, only 12 inmates and their tutors were allowed to attend classes simultaneously. Consequently, two-one and one-half hour sessions were held each afternoon. Tutors and students were matched. Evening and weekend tutorial sessions were scheduled. Each tutor was required to maintain records and gave weekly progress reports to the project instructor.

In February, LPCC officials requested a class for female inmates and one for sheriff deputies. The project director gave his

approval and classes were established.

As occurred in Phase I of the project, the turnover rate of inmates made it imperative that the project instructor have on-going programs for all five phases of the project. Consequently, additional tutor training sessions were held. There was continuous dissemination of information about the program to the inmate population. Enrollment, testing and evaluation was incessant.

At the termination of Phase II, the success of the program was still evident. LPCC officials still recognized this program as the best of those offered inmates through their rehabilitation program. Interest in the program has remained so great that a waiting list is still in effect.

During the project term, seven (7) formal commencement exercises were conducted within the LPCC facility. Each of the graduates and their respective tutors were allowed to invite two guests. State, parish and city officials, along with numerous school board members, were in attendance.

The overall LPCJP Program has served 910 inmates. Three hundred four (304) were recommended for the G.E.D. test. Ninety-three (93) inmates served as teacher aides and/or tutors.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Throughout its term, the project has continued to provide an educational program that allowed inmates to prepare for, and receive their high school equivalency diploma. It taught others important life-coping skills. It created an awareness in the community of the value and need for such a program. It helped identify various

educational needs of an inmate population. It pointed out the value of an educational program, such as adult education, that aims at spreading knowledge and skills within a community. It indicated that a low level of education gave these inmates a lack of confidence in themselves and their own capabilities, and that their participation in the LPCJP Program enhanced their personal confidence immeasurably.

The literate inmates have enthusiastically participated as teacher aides/tutors to enable the project to succeed. They shared their pride in student accomplishments. They were vital to the program.

The inmate students themselves were an important element in the recruitment and retention of students. Their individual achievements and successes were shared with other potential students and the inmate population at large. It demonstrated that the degree of cooperation between education and prison officials impacted directly on the degree of success the project achieved. Test results demonstrated good overall educational advancement. Eight released inmates are now enrolled in college. Four others have managerial jobs in the community. Several others are enrolled in "outside" adult education classes. Some have transferred to state prison facilities and are enrolled in G.E.D. programs there; while six others still in the parish facility are now enrolled in college level correspondence courses. The project instructor serves as proctor to these individuals.

LPCJP served 910 inmates. It has the potential to serve even larger numbers. Consequently, it is strongly recommended that the program be renewed as soon as funds become available.

LOUISIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P. O. BOX 44064
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804

SPECIAL EXPERIMENTAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM
FINAL EXPENDITURE REPORT

DE FORM 51J-D

CONTRACTOR OR GRANTEE (Name and address)
Lafayette Parish School Board
P. O. Drawer 2158
Lafayette, LA 70502

DEPT. OF ED. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER
ABE-2-87

FISCAL YEAR OF AWARD: 1986-87
PHASE: III

PERIOD OF CONTRACT OR GRANT
From 9/86 To 9/87

INSTRUCTIONS. An original and three signed copies are to be submitted within thirty days following termination of the project.

MAIL TO:
Louisiana State Department of Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

PART I – EXPENDITURES	AMOUNT BUDGETED (a)	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES (b)	BALANCE (Col a minus Col b) (c)
A. DIRECT COSTS - ALL SOURCES			
1. PERSONNEL SALARIES	$		
A. PROJECT DIRECTOR		$	
B. OTHER KEY PERSONNEL, IF ANY			
C. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF AND COUNSELORS (No. Full Time ; No. Part Time 2)	10,161.00	10,161.75	
D. CONSULTANTS (No.)			
E. SECRETARIAL AND CLERICAL (No. 1)	1,000.00	999.16	
F. OTHER SUPPORTING STAFF (No. 1)	1,500.00	1,150.16	
G. SUBTOTAL FOR PERSONNEL SALARIES	$12,661.00	$ 12,311.07	$ 349.93
2. OTHER DIRECT OPERATING COSTS			
A. TRAVEL	$	$	$
B. EQUIPMENT (Rental and purchases)			
C. MINOR REMODELING OF SPACE			
D. OTHER DIRECT EXPENSES (SUM OF (1) THROUGH (6))			
(1) REQUIRED COSTS, IF ANY		( )	
(2) EMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND BENEFITS		( )	
(3) COMMUNICATION COSTS		( )	
(4) SUPPLIES, PRINTING, AND PRINTED MATERIALS	4,000.00	(3,960.79)	
(5) RENTAL OF SPACE		( )	
(6) UTILITIES AND CUSTODIAL SERVICES (If not included in any other item of this section and/or in indirect costs)		( )	
E. SUBTOTAL - OTHER DIRECT OPERATING COSTS	$ 4,000.00	$ 3,960.79	$ 39.21
F. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (Sum of Lines D and E)	$16,661.00	$ 16,271.86	$ 389.14
B. COST SHARING			
1. CONTRIBUTIONS OF GRANTEE	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ -0-
2. CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OTHER SOURCES			
3. TOTAL COST SHARING	$	$	$
C. TOTAL STATE DIRECT COSTS (Line A1 minus line B3)	$16,661.00	$ 16,271.86	$ 389.14
D. INDIRECT COSTS (Not to exceed 8 percent of Total State Direct Costs, Line C)	1,333.00	1,333.00	-0-
E. TOTAL STATE FUNDS EXPENDED (Line C plus Line D)	$17,994.00	$ 17,604.86	$ 389.14

PART II – CASH SUMMARY	
A. TOTAL AMOUNT OF GRANT	$17,994.00
B. TOTAL STATE GRANT FUNDS EXPENDED (Same as Part I, Line F, column b)	17,604.86
C. TOTAL GRANT FUNDS RECEIVED FROM STATE	17,994.00
D. BALANCE DUE CONTRACTOR OR GRANTEE AGENCY (or refund due State Government)	$ 389.14

I CERTIFY THAT ALL OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE

SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	DATE	SIGNATURE OF FISCAL OFFICER AUTHORIZED TO REPRESENT GRANTEE AGENCY	DATE
Robert Rousseau	10/5/87	[illegible]	10/7/87

EXHIBIT D

BEST COPY AVAILABLE